	Case 2:04-cv-00530-TSZ Document 35 F	elled 05/16/05 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
8	AT SEATTLE	
9	101D1 DD 1 D 2 D D D D D D D D D D D D D D	
10	JOHN BRADSTREET and VALI EBERHARDT,	N C04 5207
11	Plaintiffs,	No. C04-530Z
12	v.	ORDER
13	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
14	Defendant.	
15		
16 17	The Court GRANTS Defendant's Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction Pursuant	
18	to I.R.C. § 7422(e), docket no. 16. Under 26 U.S.C. § 7422(e), a district court "shall lose	
19	jurisdiction of [a] taxpayer's suit" when the IRS mails a notice of deficiency for the same tax	
20	year in question prior to the hearing of the suit and the taxpayer files a petition with the Tax	
21	Court for redetermination of the asserted deficiency. 26 U.S.C. § 7422(e); see also Statland	
22	v. United States, 178 F.3d 465, 471 (7th Cir. 1999). A valid deficiency notice is a pre-	
23	requisite to Tax Court jurisdiction. <u>Scar v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue</u> , 814 F.2d 1363, 1366 (9th Cir. 1987). "Before issuing a notice of deficiency the Commissioner	
24	must make an actual determination of the taxpayer's liability." <u>Kantor v. Commissioner of</u>	
25	Internal Revenue, 998 F.2d 1514, 1521 (9th Cir. 1993).	
26		
	ODDED 1	
	ORDER 1–	

The Court finds that the Plaintiffs have filed a petition for redetermination with the United States Tax Court with respect to the same income tax year, 1999, at issue in this refund suit. See Amended Hankla Decl., docket no. 21, Exhibit. After reviewing the Notice of Deficiency and accompanying calculation statement, the Court finds that there is no blatant error in the calculation statement which would suggest that the Commissioner had not made a determination using the taxpayers' return for tax year 1999. See Hankla Decl., docket no. 34, Exhibit. The Court concludes that the deficiency notice was valid; therefore, this Court lost jurisdiction in this case when Plaintiffs filed their petition for redetermination. For these reasons, the Court DISMISSES this action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 16th day of May, 2005.

Thomas S. Zilly
United States District Judge

ORDER 2-